

**REMARKS-General**

1. The newly drafted independent claim 7 incorporates all structural limitations of the original claim 1 and includes further limitations previously brought forth in the disclosure. No new matter has been included. All new claims 7-12 are submitted to be of sufficient clarity and detail to enable a person of average skill in the art to make and use the instant invention, so as to be pursuant to 35 USC 112.

**Response to Rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35USC112**

2. The applicant submits that the newly drafted claims 7-12 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the instant invention, as pursuant to 35USC112.

**Response to Rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35USC103**

3. The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 over Wood et al. (US 6,641,164) in view of Schaaf et al. (US 6,209,892). Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 103:

“(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is **not identically** disclosed or described as set forth in **section 102 of this title**, if the **differences** between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the **subject matter as a whole would have been obvious** at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.”

4. In view of 35 U.S.C. 103(a), it is apparent that to be qualified as a prior art under 35USC103(a), the prior art must be cited under 35USC102(a)~(g) but the disclosure of the prior art and the invention are not identical and there are one or more differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art. In addition, such differences between the subject matter sought to be patented **as a whole** and the prior art are obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains.

5. In other words, the differences between the subject matter sought to be patent as a whole of the instant invention and Wood which is qualified as prior art of the instant invention under 35USC102(b) are obvious in view of Schaaf at the time the invention

was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains.

6. Therefore, the difference between Wood and the instant invention as claimed in claims 7 to 12 is not limited to the disclosure of "stroller", but includes the following distinctive features:

(i) a receiving cavity, having a size adapted for substantially disposing the car seat therein, formed between the boundary frame and the regular seat (as claimed in claim 7);

(ii) a **connecting unit** provided at a rear side of the back support of the regular seat (as claimed in claim 7);

(iii) a **holding belt** having a first end connected to the connecting unit and a second end affixed with a belt connector detachably fastened with the unit connector to form a holding loop having a size enough for encirclingly holding the car seat on the stroller through the fastening slot of the car seat to retain the car seat on the stroller at a position that a baby or a young child sat on the car seat is facing rearward (as claimed in claim 7);

(iv) a **buckle plug** affixed to the second end of the holding belt and a **buckle socket** provided at the unit connector to detachably connect with the buckle plug so as to form the holding loop of the holding belt for securing with the car seat (as claimed in claim 8); and

(v) means for selectively adjusting the size of the holding loop of the holding belt for tightly holding the car seat with the stroller frame, wherein the adjustment means comprises at least an adjusting member coupled on the holding belt to selectively lock up the belt connector at a position along the holding belt such that the size of the holding loop is adjusted when the length of between the belt connector and the first end of the holding belt is adjusted (as claimed in claims 9-12).

7. Accordingly, Wood discloses a stroller assembly comprising means for releasably securing an infant seat to the stroller frame, wherein the securing means includes a first strap having a first end attached to the stroller frame. Wood merely

teaches the first strap is substantially storable under the seat-bottom portion of the seat pad between the seat pad and the seat sling without any mention of any car seat fastening arrangement incorporating with a securing arrangement for a seat belt of a vehicle to fasten in position. The instant invention discloses the securing arrangement has a fastening slot integrally formed at every ordinary car seat such that the parents are able to secure the car seat in the vehicle by fastening the seat belt through the fastening slot. Therefore, the parents are able to secure the car seat on the stroller of the instant invention by fastening the holding belt through the fastening slot as well.

8. Schaaf, on the other hand, describes a baby stroller apparatus which comprises a frame adapted for detachably mounting a car seat S thereto. Schaaf merely teaches (column 9, lines 22-24) "To mount the car seat S on stroller 10, slots 170 and 180 are aligned with a corresponding pair of crossbar member 46, 48, 50" without any mention of any elongated belt encircling the car seat to detachably attach to the unit connector at the rear side of the back support.

9. The applicant respectfully submits that the advantages of the connecting unit provided at the rear side of the back support are shown as follow.

(a) The forward and backward movements of the car seat with respect to the driving movement of the stroller can be minimized when the holding belt encircles the car seat as if the position of the car seat with respect to the vehicle' seat when the seat belt is fastened to the car seat.

(b) The fastening operation of the connecting unit can be simply achieved since the parents are able to easily operate the connecting unit at the rear side of the stroller.

(c) The engagement between the belt connector and the unit connector is ensured by observation. The belt connector may be accidentally unsecured with the unit connector and cannot be seen if the unit connector is provided underneath the regular seat.

10. The Examiner appears to reason that since Wood teaches that an infant seat is mounted to the stroller frame via a strap of a securing means, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the securing means to position the connecting unit at the rear side of the back support. But this is clearly **not** a proper basis for

combining references in making out an obviousness rejection of the present claims. Rather, the invention must be considered as a whole and there must be something in the reference that suggests the combination or the modification. See Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick, 221 U.S.P.Q. 481, 488 (Fed. Cir. 1984) ("The claimed invention must be considered as a whole, and the question is whether there is something in the prior art as a whole to suggest the desirability, and thus the obviousness, of making the combination"), In re Gordon, 221 U.S.P.Q. 1125, 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1984), ("The mere fact that the prior art could be so modified would not have made the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification.") In re Laskowski, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d 1397, 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1989), ("Although the Commissioner suggests that [the structure in the primary prior art reference] could readily be modified to form the [claimed] structure, "[t]he mere fact that the prior art could be modified would not have made the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification.")

11. In the present case, there is no such suggestion. Wood and Schaaf perform very different types of stroller structure. In any case, even combining Wood and Schaaf would not provide the invention as claimed -- a clear indicia of nonobviousness. Ex parte Schwartz, slip op. p.5 (BPA&I Appeal No. 92-2629 October 28, 1992), ("Even if we were to agree with the examiner that it would have been obvious to combine the reference teachings in the manner proposed, the resulting package still would not comprise zipper closure material that terminates short of the end of the one edge of the product containing area, as now claimed."). That is, modifying Wood with Schaaf, as proposed by the Examiner, would not provide a stroller having a unit connector provided at a rear side of the back support of the regular seat and a holding belt having an end detachably fastened with the unit connector to form a holding loop for encirclingly holding the car seat on the stroller through the fastening slot of the car seat to retain the car seat on the stroller.

12. Applicant believes that for all of the foregoing reasons, all of the claims are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

**The Cited but Non-Applied References**

13. The cited but not relied upon references have been studied and are greatly appreciated, but are deemed to be less relevant than the relied upon references.

14. In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are requested. Allowance of claims 7-12 at an early date is solicited.

15. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is needed in order to place the application in condition for allowance, he is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Raymond Y. Chan  
Reg. Nr.: 37,484  
108 N. Ynez Ave.  
Suite 128  
Monterey Park, CA 91754  
Tel.: 1-626-571-9812  
Fax.: 1-626-571-9813

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this corresponding is being deposited with the United States Postal Service by First Class Mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" on the date below.

Date: December 24, 2000

Signature:   
Person Signing: Raymond Y. Chan